

I strongly contest that this is nothing more than a 'trojan horse' to install warehouses in green rural countryside, and the rail freight element is a front to bypass local planning procedures.

This will have, and is already having, a significant effect on the local villages; not just on the landscape and infrastructure but also the health and wellbeing of the residents. It is already having detrimental effects to personal lives, adding pressure and stress, worrying about the devastating effect this would have.

My concerns are:

- Visual changes we will experience in the village. I was unable to see representations of these changes as the viewpoints provided are quite irrelevant, unrealistic and misleading. Images from the local park (Roundhills Park) in the middle of the village, areas regularly used by the villagers and other similar relevant viewpoints, such as from residences on Burbage Common Road, would have been more accurately reflective of the colossal changes.
- The visual and audio effects of the stacking of containers and how this would appear from Elmesthorpe and the SSSI of Burbage Common immediately adjacent to the site.
- Poor mental health is one of the leading contributors to absence in the workplace and it is well documented that green space has a huge beneficial impact on mental health. This proposed development is not just reducing green space, but actively taking it away from people, like myself, that moved to a rural village to benefit from this green space.
- The devastation to the wildlife and vegetation is to be mitigated by the development of a new green area. I struggle to comprehend how the destruction of grassland, trees and hedgerows on this scale can be offset by a new area of a much smaller scale on site. If Tritax are planning on offsetting this on an alternative site, this is of no benefit to the residents and wildlife it has displaced in Elmesthorpe and the surrounding area.
- I would like to see the measurements of the current carbon collection of the site, the potential carbon collection of the site when used for agriculture and measurements of an apparently net carbon neutral site when HGV traffic, workforce traffic, gas power plant and other associated activities are taken into account. The current figures quoted for a net carbon neutral site are fictitious, whimsical and misleading.
- The proposed development is promoted to be of national significance and situated in the "golden triangle". This triangle involves anywhere loosely between the M6, M1 and M42, there is nothing making the specific location of the proposed HNRFI "perfect" yet has been conveniently billed

as the ideal location. This is misleading and acts only to distract from considering more appropriate locations.

- Looking at a rail map alone, and I would suggest Coventry would be a much more suitable location to reduce HGV's, on multiple main lines and good road access already established. Looking at a road map it makes even less sense, you have simply picked a location furthest away from the very locations all the freight movements need to supply. Sites such as East Midlands Gateway provide infrastructure that is already in place, without the great sacrifice of the quality of life of surrounding residents and loss of valuable and rich habitat and farmland. These existing sites offer potential for expansion and immediate benefit to the infrastructure at National Level.
- On top of this there are some seriously confusing calculations: up to 76 HGV's per train and up to 16 trains per day resulting removal of 1.6 billion HGV kilometres per year? If this calculation is on the main consultation documents, how can we trust any of the calculations or conclusions within this proposal?
- Whilst the creation of M69 junction 2 access will be beneficial to the immediate residents, the overall effect would be an increase that the surrounding road infrastructure and villages would be unable to support.
- Inappropriate and inadequate traffic mitigation.
- Flooding is a very real and serious risk in the area, which doesn't appear to have been investigated properly. The flood risk reporting may well have been of a narrative that was pleasing to Tritax, but it does not reflect the true character of the flood risk in the area of the site, nor of the areas surrounding that. As residents who have lived in this area and experienced it first hand; the flood mitigation will fail and not only will the residents and the surrounding areas further suffer, but the HNRFI site will consequently also fail because of it.
- Night lighting on the site will disrupt sleep and disrupt our rich and varied wildlife.
- Unrelenting noise from the site will disrupt sleep/general life. This will affect my work performance and the performance and behaviour of my child(ren).
- The 10 year construction period. Serious consideration needs to go into how to make this bearable for those of us literally on their doorstep.

On the basis of unsuitability of location, I cannot support this proposal and object to the proposed HNRFI development in its entirety.

Yours Sincerely,

Alex Roper

